



PATENT

Client-Matter No.: 66654-669 (P-LJ 4859)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of:) Confirmation No.: 7275
Ruoslahti and Pasqualini) Group Art Unit: 1632
) Examiner: S. Priebe
Serial No.: 09/922,227) CERTIFICATE OF MAILING BY "EXPRESS MAIL"
) "EXPRESS MAIL" MAILING LABEL NUMBER: EL 985982981 US
Filed: August 2, 2001) DATE OF DEPOSIT: September 2, 2003
)
For: METHOD OF IDENTIFYING) I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS PAPER OR FEE IS BEING
MOLECULES THAT HOME TO A) DEPOSITED WITH THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE
SELECTED ORGAN IN VIVO) "EXPRESS MAIL POST OFFICE TO ADDRESSEE" SERVICE UNDER
) 37 C.F.R. 1.10 ON THE DATE INDICATED ABOVE, AND IS
) ADDRESSED TO: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, P.O. BOX 1450
) ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450.

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Rebecca Cliford
(TYPED OR PRINTED NAME OF PERSON MAILING PAPER OR FEE)

Rebecca Cliford
(SIGNATURE OF PERSON MAILING PAPER OR FEE)

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION

Responsive to the Communication mailed July 30, 2003, entry of following remarks and terminal disclaimer submitted herewith is respectfully requested.

REMARKS

The Communication states that a proper response to the obviousness-type double patenting rejections set forth in the Office Action mailed November 5, 2002, is required. In this regard, claims 1 to 3, 5 and 6 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly unpatentable over claims 1 to 5 of U.S. Patent No. 5,622,699; claims 1 to 6 stand rejected as allegedly unpatentable over claims 1 to 21 of U.S. Patent No. 6,068,829; claims 1 to 6 stand rejected as allegedly unpatentable over claims 1 to 10 of U.S. Patent No. 6,296,832; and claims 1 to 6

RECEIVED
SEP 09 2003
U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE